

(*Stipulating Parties on Signature Page*)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:

All Indirect Purchaser Actions

Case No. 07-5944 SC

MDL No. 1917

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER REGARDING BRIEFING FOR
MOTIONS IN LIMINE FILED BY THE
INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS,
THE TOSHIBA DEFENDANTS AND THE
SAMSUNG SDI DEFENDANTS

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Stipulation and Order Regarding Scheduling (Doc. No. 3182), the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (“IPPs”) filed nineteen motions in limine (“IPP motions in limine”)¹ on February 13, 2015;

WHEREAS, on February 13, 2015, the Toshiba Defendants filed four separate motions in limine (“Toshiba separate motions in limine”)² and twelve motions in limine jointly with the other defendants (“Toshiba joint motions in limine”)³ that pertain to the IPPs;

WHEREAS, on February 13, 2015, the Samsung SDI Defendants filed two separate

¹ See Doc. Nos. 3537, 3538, 3539, 3540, 3541, 3542, 3543, 3544, 3545, 3546, 3547, 3548, 3549, 3550, 3551, 3552, 3553, 3554 and 3555.

² See Doc Nos. 3573, 3577, 3588 and 3576.

³ See Doc Nos. 3556, 3557, 3559, 3563-3, 3568, 3571, 3572, 3579, 3581, 3583, 3589, and 3592.

1 motions in limine⁴ (“Samsung separate motions limine”) and twelve motions in limine jointly
 2 with the other defendants⁵ (“Samsung joint motions in limine”) that pertain to the IPPs;

3 WHEREAS, IPPs’ MIL Nos. 3 (Doc. No. 3539) and 11 (Doc. No. 3547), and Defendants’
 4 Joint MIL No. 14 (Doc. No. 3581), were resolved by stipulation dated February 27, 2015 (Doc.
 5 No. 3639);

6 WHEREAS, SDI’s MIL No. 2 (Doc. No. 3565) was not opposed by IPPs;

7 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Stipulation and Order Regarding Deadline for Briefing and
 8 Hearing Date for Motions in Limine (Doc. No. 3605) (the “MIL Order”), all parties filed
 9 responses to the motions pertaining to them on February 27, 2015;⁶

10 WHEREAS, pursuant to the MIL Order, replies in support of the motions in limine are due
 11 on March 6, 2015;

12 WHEREAS, the Toshiba Defendants also filed a Motion to Strike Class Representatives
 13 with Inadequate Proof of Their Individual Purchases of Televisions or Monitors (Doc. No. 3595)
 14 (“Motion to Strike”);

15 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Stipulation and Order Regarding Briefing for the Toshiba
 16 Defendants’ Motion to Decertify the Statewide IPP Classes for Damages and Motion to Strike
 17 Class Representatives with Inadequate Proof of their Individual Purchases of Televisions or
 18 Monitors (Doc. No. 3630), the IPPs’ opposition to the Motion to Strike is due on March 6, 2015
 19 and the Toshiba Defendants’ reply is due on March 17, 2015;

20 WHEREAS, counsel for the IPPs, the Toshiba Defendants and the Samsung SDI
 21 Defendants have met and conferred and agree that an extension of the briefing schedule on these
 22 motions is appropriate and will aid in the efficient resolution of the litigation;

23 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between counsel for the IPPs, the

24 ⁴ See Doc. Nos. 3560-61, 3565.

25 ⁵ See fn. 3, *supra*.

26 ⁶ The IPPs and the Toshiba Defendants entered into a separate stipulation extending the briefing
 27 schedule for Defendants’ MIL #2 and DAP MIL #11, which became an order of the Court on
 28 February 25, 2015 (Doc No. 3631). Defendants’ MIL #2 and DAP MIL #11 are not the subject of
 this Stipulation and Proposed Order.

1 Toshiba Defendants and the Samsung SDI Defendants as follows:

2 1. The replies in support of the IPPs' motions in limine, the Toshiba and SDI separate
3 motions in limine, and the Toshiba and SDI joint motions in limine (as they pertain to the IPPs)
4 may be filed no later than March 16, 2015;

5 2. IPPs' opposition to the Toshiba Defendants' Motion to Strike must be filed no later
6 than March 16, 2015;

7 3. The Toshiba Defendants' reply in support of their Motion to Strike may be filed no
8 later than March 27, 2015.

9 The undersigned parties jointly and respectfully request that the Court enter this
10 stipulation as an order.

12 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: 3/6/15



15 Hon. Samuel Conti
United States District Judge

19 DATED: March 4, 2015

By: /s/

20 Mario N. Alioto (56433)
Lauren C. Capurro (241151)
21 TRUMP, ALIOTO, TRUMP & PRESCOTT LLP
2280 Union Street
22 San Francisco, CA 94123
23 Telephone: (415) 563-7200
24 Facsimile: (415) 346-0679
malioto@tatp.com
laurenrussell@tatp.com

25 *Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs*

1 DATED: March 4, 2015

2 **WHITE & CASE LLP**
3 By: /s/
4 Christopher M. Curran (*pro hac vice*)
ccurran@whitecase.com
5 Lucius B. Lau (*pro hac vice*)
alau@whitecase.com
6 Dana E. Foster (*pro hac vice*)
defoster@whitecase.com
7 701 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
tel.: (202) 626-3600
fax: (202) 639-9355

8 *Counsel to Defendants Toshiba Corporation,
Toshiba America, Inc., Toshiba America Information
Systems, Inc., Toshiba America Consumer Products,
L.L.C., and Toshiba America Electronic
Components, Inc.*

9
10 DATED: March 4, 2015

11 **SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON**

12 By: /s/
13 GARY L. HALLING (SBN 66087)
14 E-mail: ghalling@sheppardmullin.com
15 JAMES L. MCGINNIS (SBN 95788)
16 E-mail: jmcginnis@sheppardmullin.com
17 MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH (SBN 203524)
18 E-mail: mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com
19 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 434-9100
Facsimile: (415) 434-3947

20 *Counsel for Defendants Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.,
Samsung SDI America, Inc., Samsung SDI
(Malaysia) SDN. BHD., Samsung SDI Mexico S.A.
de C.V., Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda., Shenzhen
Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., and Tianjin Samsung SDI
Co., Ltd.*

21
22 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this
23 document has been obtained from each of the above signatories.